



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,549	01/12/2001	Hidehiko Okada	029471/0146	9407

22428 7590 04/06/2005

FOLEY AND LARDNER
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,549

Applicant(s)

OKADA, HIDEHIKO

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/1/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 10/1/04.
2. Claims 2-26 are pending in this application. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-17 and 20-25 are independent claims; claims 24-26 are new; claim 1 has been cancelled; and, claims 2-11, 14-17 and 20-23 have been amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Linnett et al. ("Linnett") in view of Kerr.

As per claim 8, although Linnett teaches an information processing apparatus comprising a controller managing control so that an applicable use of a base software is displayed in a menu form on a screen of a display device by an overlay software external to the base software, the base software having no function of displaying and highlighting a GUI widget to be operated next, so that, upon selection of one use on the menu, detection of a displayed position of the GUI widget to be operated next is displayed in a highlighted fashion from other GUI widgets on the screen, in accordance with a previously registered operating sequence (figs. 1 and 3; col. 4, lines 43-53; *an applicable use of a base software in a menu form on a screen of a display device is displayed in fig. 3 not by a base software having no function of displaying nor*

highlighting a GUI widget to be operated next but by a shell/overlay software analogous to an operating system shell and external to the base software, so that, upon selection of one use on the menu such as a selection of a gardening software among a listing of selectable software, a GUI widget to be acted on next is displayed in a highlighted fashion from other GUI widgets on the screen via a check mark in a box, in accordance with a previously registered operating sequence of screens or objects displayed),

Linnett does not explicitly disclose the overlay software being displayed in a relative positional relation to the screen displayed by the base software and the detection of a displayed position of the GUI widget to be operated next being determined by analyzing the screen displayed by the base software, the detection being operated by the overlay software external to the base software. Kerr teaches an overlay software being displayed in a relative positional relation to a screen displayed by a base software and a displayed position of the GUI widget to be operated next being determined by analyzing the screen displayed by the base software, the detection being operated by the overlay software external to the base software (figs. 1, 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kerr's teaching of an overlay software being displayed in a relative positional relation to a screen displayed by a base software and a displayed position of the GUI widget to be operated next being determined by analyzing the screen displayed by the base software, the detection being operated by the overlay software external to the base software of an information processing apparatus to Linnett's teaching of a displayed position of the GUI widget to be operated next of an information processing

apparatus in order to provide users with an interface that is truly customized to the level of familiarity of the user.

5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. ("Smith") in view of Linnett et al. ("Linnett").

As per claim 2, Smith teaches a GUI control method comprising displaying a cover screen hiding an inherent screen of a software on a display device and (col. 7, lines 30-32; *web browser application program 504 overlays/covers television source 502*) displaying the applicable use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen wherein if an operation on the menu on the cover screen is performed, an operation equivalent to the operation performed on the cover screen is executed on the inherent screen of the software in accordance with previously registered widget-relation information (figs. 2-6B; col. 7, lines 30-65; *control panel 508 displays the use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen*). Smith does not explicitly disclose an inherent screen operated by a base software different from an overlay software that operates the cover screen and displaying the applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen. Linnett teaches an inherent screen operated by a base software different from an overlay software that operates the cover screen and displaying the applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen (figs. 2, 9A-10B, 12 and 16; col. 1, lines 15-42; col. 16, lines 31-51; col. 9, lines 9-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Linnett's teaching of an inherent screen operated by software different from another software that operates the cover screen and displaying the applicable use of

the software that operates the inherent screen to Smith's teaching of a cover screen hiding an inherent screen of a software on a display device and displaying the applicable use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen in order to provide users with another GUI as an implementation preference that is more user friendly for novices and does not require extensive training of the user interfaces of various software products.

6. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al. ("Smith") in view of Linnett et al. ("Linnett"), and further in view of Kerr.

As per claim 9, Smith teaches a GUI control method comprising displaying a cover screen hiding an inherent screen of a software on a display device and (col. 7, lines 30-32; *web browser application program 504 overlays/covers television source 502*) displaying the applicable use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 7, lines 30-39; *control panel 508 displays the use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen*). Smith does not explicitly disclose running an overlay program operating an inherent screen, the overlay program different from and external to the base program, the cover screen hiding the inherent screen and displaying an applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen so that an action made on the menu of the cover screen is executed on the inherent screen in accordance with a previously registered operating sequence. Linnett teaches running an overlay program operating an inherent screen, the overlay program different from and external to the base program, the cover screen hiding the inherent screen and displaying an applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen so that an action made on the

menu of the cover screen is executed on the inherent screen in accordance with a previously registered operating sequence (figs.2, 9A-10B, 12 and 16; col. 1, lines 15-42; col. 16, lines 31-51; col. 9, lines 9-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Linnett's teaching of running an overlay program operating an inherent screen, the overlay program different from and external to the base program, the cover screen hiding the inherent screen and displaying an applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen so that an action made on the menu of the cover screen is executed on the inherent screen in accordance with a previously registered operating sequence to Smith's teaching of a cover screen hiding an inherent screen of a software on a display device and displaying the applicable use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen in order to provide users with another GUI as an implementation preference that is more user friendly for novices and does not require extensive training of the user interfaces of various software products.

Smith and Linnett still do not explicitly disclose the controller further controlling detection of the location on the inherent screen of the base program of a GUI widget to be actuated next in accordance with the registered operating sequence by analyzing the inherent screen displayed by the base program. Kerr teaches detection of the location on the inherent screen of the base program of a GUI widget to be actuated next in accordance with the registered operating sequence by analyzing the inherent screen displayed by the base program (*Abstract; an application program automatically creates an interface upon analyzing usage of a base program's set of operations*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kerr's

teaching of a detection of the location on the inherent screen of the base program of a GUI widget to be actuated next in accordance with the registered operating sequence by analyzing the inherent screen displayed by the base program to Smith and Linnett's teaching of a detection of the base program of a GUI widget to be actuated next in accordance with the registered operating sequence by analyzing the base program in order to provide users with an interface that is truly customized to the level of familiarity of the user.

7. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. ("Schein") in view of Smith et al. ("Smith"), in view of Linnett et al. ("Linnett") and further in view of Kerr.

As per claim 3, Schein teaches a GUI control method comprising (col. 11, lines 3-39):

a) a step of previously registering in a storage unit the applicable use of a software adapted for running on a computer, said software having a GUI (col. 5, line 61 through col. 6, line 6; figs. 14-27B);

b) a step of displaying the registered use as a menu on a screen of a display device, inputting an operational sequence of the software, as required for utilizing the software in the use, to register in the storage unit, for each use displayed on the menu (figs. 14-27B; col. 13, lines 16-42);

c) a step comprising detecting an action on the GUI widget, instructing, in accordance with the previously registered operating sequence, to detect in what position on the screen a GUI widget to be acted on next and displaying the GUI widget

in a highlighted fashion on the screen, in accordance with the detected display location of the GUI widget (fig. 2-22; col. 13, lines 16-26; col. 13, lines 34-39; *detecting an action on the "Record once..." GUI widget and instructing the system to detect in what position on the screen a GUI widget to be acted on next and displaying the GUI widget in a highlighted fashion on the screen, e.g. "Okay", wherein the instructing in accordance with the previously registered operating sequence is inherent given that described are steps in a process*);

d) on selection of the use from the menu, running the software code as required for the selected use (figs. 14-27B; col. 13, lines 16-42; *wherein running the software code are inherent in order for the required resultant action of the use selection to occur*), detecting in what location in the screen a GUI widget to be acted on next, in accordance with the operating sequence previously registered for the selected use, is displayed (figs. 14-27B; *displayed is a GUI widget to be acted on next such as "Record once..." of fig. 21, wherein the GUI widget to be acted on next constitutes a step within a hierarchical order of the operating sequence already previously registered and wherein detecting what location the GUI widget is displayed is inherent so that the system may perform the intended action associated with users' selection*) and displaying the detected GUI widget in a highlighted fashion on the screen in accordance with a detected display location of the GUI widget (figs. 14-27B; col. 13, lines 16-42; *GUI widget "Record once..." is displayed and highlighted wherein a detected display location of the GUI widget is inherent given that the GUI widget is highlighted*).

Schein does not explicitly disclose a step comprising booting, on selection of the use from the menu, the software as required for the selected use. Smith teaches a GUI control method comprising a) a step of previously registering in a storage unit the applicable use of a software adapted for running on a computer, said software having a GUI and displaying a registered use as a menu on a screen of a display device (figs. 2-6B; *the use of a software displays the use as menus and submenus*), and d) a step comprising executing or booting, on selection of the use from the menu, the software as required for the selected use (col. 9, lines 28-46). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's step of executing/booting, on selection of the use from the menu, the software as required for the selected use in a GUI control method to Schein's step of, on selection of the use from the menu, running the software code as required for the selected use in a GUI control method in order to allow users a method of downloading another type of file data.

However, Smith and Schein do not explicitly disclose the GUI widget being displayed and controlled by a second software external to the first software. Linnett teaches a GUI widget being displayed and controlled by a second software external to the first software (figs. 2, 9A-10B, 12 and 16; col. 1, lines 15-42; col. 16, lines 31-51; col. 9, lines 9-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Linnett's teaching of a GUI widget being displayed and controlled by a second software external to the first software to Smith and Schein's displayed GUI widget in order to provide users with another GUI as an implementation preference that

is more user friendly for novices and does not require extensive training of the user interfaces of various software products.

Smith, Schein and Linnett still do not explicitly disclose a registered use of the first software in a menu and analyzing the screen displayed by the first software, the detection being performed by the second software external to the first software. Kerr teaches a registered use of the first software in a menu and analyzing the screen displayed by the first software, the detection being performed by the second software external to the first software (figs. 2(A-B); Abstract; *an application program automatically creates an interface upon analyzing usage of a base program's set of operations*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Kerr's teaching of a registered use of the first software in a menu and analyzing the screen displayed by the first software, the detection being performed by the second software external to the first software to Smith, Schein and Linnett's teaching of analyzing the first software, the detection being performed by the second software external to the first software in order to provide users with an interface that is truly customized to the level of familiarity of the user.

Claim 4 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. ("Schein"), Smith et al. ("Smith"), Linnett et al. ("Linnett") and Kerr as applied to claim 3, and further in view of Barnes et al. ("Barnes").

As per claim 7, although the modified Schein teaches a GUI control method wherein in executing the GUI control, there is no necessity to modify the first software (Linnett: figs.2, 9A-10B,12 and 16; col. 1, lines 15-42; col. 16, lines 31-51; col. 9, lines 9-18; Schein: col. 11, lines 3-39), the modified Schein does not explicitly disclose not modifying the first software. Barnes teaches a method of displaying another GUI/screen display without modifying the underlying application program (col. 1, lines 11-37). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Barnes' teaching of a method of displaying another GUI/screen display without modifying the underlying application program to the modified Schein's teaching of a method of a method of displaying another GUI/screen display over an underlying application program given that such modifications may not be feasible, as the user may not have access to encrypted/proprietary program code.

9. Claims 5-6 and 10-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Smith et al. ("Smith").

As per claim 5, Kerr teaches a GUI control method executed on an overlay software program overlying one or more base software programs, comprising executing the overlay software program to perform a step of:

a) a step of registering in a storage unit the applicable use of a first base software program adapted for running on a computer wherein the first base software program has a GUI (figs. 1, 5 and 6; col. 5, lines 10-53), a screenshot for utilizing a second base software program in a selected applicable use as a cover screen and widget-relation information as to what GUI widget on the inherent screen of the second

base software program is to be acted on upon acting on any GUI widget on the cover screen (figs. 1 and 2(A-B));

b) a step of displaying the applicable use in a menu on a screen of a display device and displaying a second base software program, on selection of the applicable use from the menu, as required for the selected applicable use with a step of hiding an inherent screen of the second base software from view and visibly displaying the cover screen (figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47; *depicted and described is the process of automatically displaying registered cover screens in place of inherent screens upon running codes of base software programs and displaying applicable uses of base software programs in menus on the cover screens, e.g. cover screen menu 26 is displayed in place of cover screen 24 or vice versa*)

c) a step of detecting in what location on the inherent screen of the second base software program the GUI widget to be acted on next is being displayed in accordance with the registered widget-relation information by analyzing the inherent screen displayed by the second base software program, the detecting being performed by the overlay software program external to the base first and second software programs and a step of detecting an action on a GUI widget displayed on the cover screen, followed by displaying a next cover screen, the GUI widget on the cover screen being operated externally of the first and second base software programs by the overlay software program (figs. 1, 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47);

d) a step of issuing an operating event to the detected GUI widget (figs. 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47); and

e) a step of reproducing/copying data displayed on the GUI widget on the inherent screen on the cover screen in accordance with previously registered widget-relation information as to in which GUI widget on the cover screen the data displayed on a GUI widget on the inherent screen of the second base software program is to be copied (figs. 1, 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47).

Although Kerr teaches a step of hiding from view of an inherent screen of the base software, thereby visibly displaying the registered cover screen in place of the inherent screen and displaying the applicable use of the base software in a menu on the cover screen (figs. 2(A-B); Abstract; *an application program automatically creates an interface upon analyzing usage of a base program's set of operations*), Kerr does not explicitly disclose a step of detecting booting of the base software. Smith teaches a GUI control method comprising the steps of:

previously registering in a storage unit a screenshot for utilizing the executed or booted software in the selected use, as a cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59);

detecting an action on a GUI widget displayed on the cover screen to display a next cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59; col. 7, lines 26-40; col. 8, lines 20-33); and

previously registering in the storage unit widget-relation information as to what GUI widget on the inherent screen of the software is to be actuated upon actuation of any GUI widget on the cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59; col. 7, lines 26-40; col. 8, lines 20-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's step of executing/booting, on selection of the use from the menu, the software as required for the selected use and previously registering in a storage unit a screenshot for utilizing the executed/booted software in the selected use, as a cover screen and the steps associated with having a cover screen as described above in a GUI control method to Kerr's step of, on selection of the use from the menu, running the software code as required for the selected use in a GUI control method in order to allow a user a method of downloading another type of file data as well as providing the user with a control with which the user is familiar and intuitive to use.

As per claim 6, Kerr teaches a GUI control method comprising:

a) a step of previously registering in a storage unit the applicable use of a base software adapted for running on a computer wherein the base software has a GUI (figs. 1, 5 and 6; col. 5, lines 10-53), a screenshot for utilizing the base software in the applicable use as a cover screen and widget-relation information as to what GUI widget on the inherent screen of the base software is to be actuated upon actuation of any GUI widget on the cover screen (figs. 1 and 2(A-B));

b) a step of detecting, on running the base software code, to hide an inherent screen of the base software from view, thereby visibly displaying the registered cover screen in place of the inherent screen and displaying the applicable use of the base software in a menu on the cover screen and a step of displaying, on selection of the applicable use from the menu, the cover screen being registered for the selected applicable use (figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47; *depicted and described is the*

process of automatically displaying a registered cover screen in place of the inherent screen upon running the base software code and displaying the applicable use of the base software in a menu on the cover screen, e.g. cover screen menu 26 is displayed in place of cover screen 24 or vice versa)

c) a step of detecting in what location on the inherent screen of the base software the GUI widget to be actuated next is to be displayed in accordance with the registered widget-relation information by analyzing the inherent screen displayed by the base software, the detection being operated by the overlay software external to the base software and a step of detecting an action on a GUI widget displayed on the cover screen to display a next cover screen, the GUI widget being operated by an overlay software externally of the base software of the inherent screen (figs. 1, 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47);

d) a step of issuing an operating event to the detected GUI widget (figs. 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47); and

e) a step of reproducing/copying data displayed in the GUI widget on the inherent screen of the base software to the GUI widget on the cover screen in accordance with previously registered, in the storage unit, widget correspondence information as to in what GUI widget on the cover screen data displayed on the GUI widget on the inherent screen of the base software is to be copied (figs. 1, 2(A-B) and 7-10; col. 6, lines 14-47; *data displayed in the GUI widget on the inherent screen of the base software is reproduced as a GUI widget on the cover screen in accordance with the widget correspondence information*).

Although Kerr teaches a step of hiding from view of an inherent screen of the base software, thereby visibly displaying the registered cover screen in place of the inherent screen and displaying the applicable use of the base software in a menu on the cover screen (figs. 2(A-B); Abstract; *an application program automatically creates an interface upon analyzing usage of a base program's set of operations*), Kerr does not explicitly disclose a step of detecting booting of the base software. Smith teaches a GUI control method comprising the steps of:

previously registering in a storage unit a screenshot for utilizing the executed or booted software in the selected use, as a cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59);

detecting an action on a GUI widget displayed on the cover screen to display a next cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59; col. 7, lines 26-40; col. 8, lines 20-33); and

previously registering in the storage unit widget-relation information as to what GUI widget on the inherent screen of the software is to be actuated upon actuation of any GUI widget on the cover screen (figs. 2-6B; col. 5, lines 22-34 and lines 48-59; col. 7, lines 26-40; col. 8, lines 20-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Smith's step of executing/booting, on selection of the use from the menu, the software as required for the selected use and previously registering in a storage unit a screenshot for utilizing the executed/booted software in the selected use, as a cover screen and the steps associated with having a cover screen as described above in a

GUI control method to Kerr's step of, on selection of the use from the menu, running the software code as required for the selected use in a GUI control method in order to allow a user a method of downloading another type of file data as well as providing the user with a control with which the user is familiar and intuitive to use.

Claim 10 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 11 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 12, the modified Kerr teaches a GUI control apparatus comprising means for displaying a GUI widget for notifying the completion of processing on a current screen wherein the operation detection unit detects an operation performed on the GUI widget is detected by the widget detection unit or on the GUI widget displayed on the screen (Kerr: figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10; *completion of processing on a current screen is user confirmed*).

As per claim 13, the modified Kerr teaches a GUI control apparatus comprising means for displaying a GUI widget for notifying the completion of processing on a current screen wherein the operation detection unit detects an operation performed on the GUI widget is detected by the widget detection unit or on the GUI widget displayed on the screen (Kerr: figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10).

Claim 14 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 15 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 17 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 18 the modified Schein teaches a GUI control apparatus comprising means for displaying a GUI widget for notifying the completion of processing on a current screen wherein the operation detection unit detects an operation performed on the GUI widget is detected by the widget detection unit or on the GUI widget displayed on the screen (Kerr: figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10).

As per claim 19, the modified Schein teaches a GUI control apparatus comprising means for displaying a GUI widget for notifying the completion of processing on a current screen wherein the operation detection unit detects an operation performed on the GUI widget is detected by the widget detection unit or on the GUI widget displayed on the screen (Kerr: figs. 2(A-B) and 7-10).

Claim 20 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 22 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 23 is similar in scope to the combination of claims 5 and 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Schein et al. ("Schein").

As per claim 24, Kerr teaches a GUI control method executed on an overlay software program overlying a base software program comprising executing said overlay software program to perform the steps of:

a) displaying, in a menu form, applicable user functions of the base software program running on a computer having a display screen, the base software program displaying a plurality of GUI widgets for permitting a user to interface with the base program, the base software program having no function of highlighting a GUI widget from among the plurality of GUI widgets to be operated next by the user (figs. 2(A-B));

(b) detecting a displayed position of a GUI widget to be operated next by analyzing the screen displayed by the base software program in accordance with an operations table previously registered in a storage unit (figs. 1 and 7-10);

Kerr does not explicitly disclose the detecting being in accordance with an operating sequence and highlighting a GUI widget corresponding to the detected position from among the plurality of GUI widgets, to be operated next by the user upon selection by the user of one of the displayed applicable user functions wherein detecting a displayed position of a GUI widget and highlighting the GUI widget are performed upon each operation of said operating sequence to realize the selected user function. Schein teaches the detecting being in accordance with an operating sequence and

drawing attention to/highlighting a GUI widget corresponding to the detected position from among the plurality of GUI widgets, to be operated next by the user upon selection by the user of one of the displayed applicable user functions wherein detecting a displayed position of a GUI widget and highlighting the GUI widget are performed upon each operation of said operating sequence to realize the selected user function (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29; *drawing attention to/highlighting the GUI widget via text instruction displayed in window 218 upon each operation of said operating sequence to realize the selected user function*). Therefore, it would be obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Schein's GUI method wherein the detecting is in accordance with an operating sequence and highlighting a GUI widget corresponding to the detected position from among the plurality of GUI widgets, to be operated next by the user upon selection by the user of one of the displayed applicable user functions wherein detecting a displayed position of a GUI widget and highlighting the GUI widget are performed upon each operation of said operating sequence to realize the selected user function to Kerr's teaching of a GUI method in order to tell users what action to take and the results of the action.

11. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schein et al. ("Schein") in view of Linnett et al. ("Linnett").

As per claim 25, Schein teaches a method of providing a computer user with guidance in performing a desired function, the method comprising:

displaying on a display device of a user computer a menu of applicable functions of a base software program running on the computer (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29);

retrieving an interaction sequence file corresponding to a user selected function from the menu (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29, *element 218 with respective portions of the specification*; col. 11, lines 36-44);

detecting, by analyzing a screen generated by the base software program, the displayed location of a GUI widget to be operated next by the user as determined from the interaction sequence file (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29, *element 218 with respective portions of the specification*; col. 11, lines 36-44);

drawing attention to/highlighting the GUI widget (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29; *drawing attention to/highlighting the GUI widget via text instruction displayed in window 218*); and

accepting a user interaction with the GUI widget (figs. 1, 7-20, 23, 24 and 26-29; *accepting user interaction with the GUI widget is inherent given that subsequent screens are displayed in accordance with the interaction sequence*). Schein does not explicitly disclose the method being performed by an overlay software program external to the base software program. Linnett teaches a method of providing a computer user with guidance wherein the method is performed by an overlay software program external to the base software program (figs. 2, 9A-10B, 12 and 16; col. 1, lines 15-42; col. 16, lines 31-51; col. 9, lines 9-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Linnett's teaching of an inherent screen operated by software different from another software that operates the cover screen and displaying the applicable use of the software that operates the inherent screen to Schein's teaching of a cover screen hiding an inherent screen of a software on a display

device and displaying the applicable use of the software in a menu form on the cover screen in order to provide users with another GUI as an implementation preference that is more user friendly for novices and does not require extensive training of the user interfaces of various software products.

As per claim 26, the modified Schein teaches a method of providing a computer user with guidance in performing a desired function wherein the method comprises displaying a message to the user regarding the GUI widget (Linnett: figs. 2, 9A-10B, 12 and 16; *messages are displayed regarding GUI widgets*).

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-4 and 7-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquires

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

Art Unit: 2174

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
March 12, 2005

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER